UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/817,135	04/01/2004	Valerie J. Marty	200309766	1502	
22879 7590		EXAMINER			
HEWLETT PACK. P O BOX 272400,	3404 E. HARMONY	CULBERT, ROBERTS P			
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
FORT COLLINS, C	CO 80327-2400	1763			
SHORTENED STATUTORY PE	RIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTH	IS	04/06/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

•		Applic	ation No.	Applicant(s)	. 4
		10/81	7,135	MARTY ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Exami	ner	Art Unit	
			s Culbert	1763	
Period fo	- The MAILING DATE of this communi r Reply	cation appears on	the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence add	ess
A SHO WHIC Exten after: If NO Failur Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MASSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this community period for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply very received by the Office later than three months af dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DATE OF if 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no inication. utory period will apply ar vill, by statute, cause the	THIS COMMUNIO o event, however, may a r nd will expire SIX (6) MON application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this com DANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				•	
2a) <u></u> 3) <u></u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed This action is FINAL . 2 Since this application is in condition foliation in accordance with the practice on of Claims	b)⊠ This action i or allowance exc	s non-final. ept for formal matt	•	nerits is
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-5 and 7-54</u> is/are pending ta) Of the above claim(s) <u>30-54</u> is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1,3-5 and 8-29</u> is/are rejected to. Claim(s) <u>2 and 7</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrict	withdrawn from	consideration.		
Application	on Papers				
10)	The specification is objected to by the The drawing(s) filed on is/are: Applicant may not request that any object Replacement drawing sheet(s) including The oath or declaration is objected to	a) accepted or tion to the drawing(the correction is rec	s) be held in abeyan quired if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119			·	
12)[] <i>A</i>	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority of Certified copies of the priority of Some Some Some Some None Some Some Some Some Some Some Some Som	locuments have be locuments have be f the priority docu al Bureau (PCT f	peen received. Deen received in A Diments have been Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National St	age
A441	· · ·	V.			
2) Notice 3) Inform	(s) of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	O-948)	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date formal Patent Application 	

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/21/07 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/21/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant has argued that Whitesides does not teach a method creating a patterned feature on a substrate comprising: preparing a solution of organic molecules having self-assembling properties, applying the solution to an aligning surface, contacting the aligning surface with the substrate, and separating the aligning surface from the substrate, leaving patterns of the organic molecules on the substrate.

However the arguments are not persuasive because, Whitesides et al. clearly and expressly teach a method comprising leaving patterns of organic molecules on a substrate by applying a solution of organic molecules on a planar aligning surface, contacting the aligning surface with the substrate, and separating the aligning surface from the substrate, as broadly recited in claims 1 and 23, as amended.

Moreover, applicant's arguments amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Application/Control Number: 10/817,135 Page 3

Art Unit: 1763

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-10, 12-14, 16 and 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,180,239 to Whitesides et al.

Regarding Claims 1 and 23, Whitesides et al. teach a method creating a patterned feature on a substrate comprising: preparing a solution of organic molecules having self-assembling properties (27), applying the solution to an aligning surface (20), contacting the aligning surface with the substrate (30), and separating the aligning surface from the substrate, (Figure 1d) leaving patterns of the organic molecules on the substrate.

Regarding Claims 3 and 4, Whitesides et al. further teach preparing at least two different species of organic molecules to preferentially align to a plurality of features.

Regarding Claims 5 and 24, Whitesides et al. teach utilizing the ordered patterns of organic molecules as a mask.

Regarding Claims 8 and 9, Whitesides et al. teach the organic molecules have a molecular head group, tail and optionally a functional group.

Regarding Claim 10, Whitesides et al. teach an aromatic ring functionality (benzyl group) See for example, C11, L55 of U.S. Patent 5,512,131 incorporated by reference.

Regarding Claim 12, Whitesides teach the ordered patterns include substantially parallel lines (Figure 4a) Note that the size of the tail group inherently helps determine the lateral spacing between lines although not expressly recited.

١,

Art Unit: 1763

Regarding Claim 13, Whitesides et al. teach preparing a solvent system having organic molecules therein, and wherein the organic molecules used to prepare the solvent system determine the lateral spacing.

Regarding Claim 14, Whitesides et al. teach choosing a functional group based on process requirements.

Regarding Claim 16, Whitesides et al. teach the organic molecules contain a thiol group and the substrate a layer of gold. (See Example 2, as well as U.S. Patent 5,512,131 incorporated by reference)

Regarding Claim 20 Whitesides et al. teach the organic molecules are laterally spaced after they are applied as broadly claimed. Note that any plurality of molecules is "laterally spaced" as broadly claimed by applicant.

Regarding Claim 25, Whitesides et al. teach introducing additional organic molecule species to the surface, which preferentially align to the functional groups existing along defined patterns.

Regarding Claim 26, Whitesides et al. teach introducing additional organic molecule species having functional groups to the surface to cause certain molecules to preferentially align with according to functional groups along pre-defined patterns. (C13, L29-39)

Regarding Claims 27 and 28, Whitesides et al. teach etching the substrate.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of

Art Unit: 1763

each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 11, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,180,239 to Whitesides et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,562,398 to Braach-Maksvytis et al.

Regarding Claims 11, 15 and 22, Whitesides teach phenyl groups on an alkyl hydrocarbon group and the like, (See C11, L U.S. Patent 5,512,131 incorporated by reference) but do not expressly teach biphenyl groups. However it is well known in the art of forming molecular structures having self-assembling properties to use biphenyl groups. For example, Braach-Maksvytis et al. (C7, L24-48) teach the use of biphenyl groups. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use biphenyl groups in order to impart structural stabilizing characteristics to the molecules as taught by Braach-Maksvytis et al.

Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,180,239 to Whitesides et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,578,351 to Shashidhar et al.

Regarding Claims 17-19, Whitesides teach platinum and palladium may be used as the substrate, (See C10, L57-60 of U.S. Patent 5,512,131 incorporated by reference) but do not expressly teach isocyanate groups. However it is well known in the art of forming molecular structures having self-assembling properties to use isocyanate groups with platinum or palladium. For example, Shashidhar et al. (C4, L45-65) teach the use of isocyanate groups with compatible surfaces such as platinum and palladium. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use isocyanate groups in order to impart liquid crystalline characteristics to the molecules as taught by Shashidhar et al. Note that the limitation reciting particles of palladium preferentially align to the surface along aligned molecules according to their functional groups reads on a palladium substrate having an isocyanate functional group since the same will be preferentially aligned and the substrate contains particles of palladium.

١

Art Unit: 1763

Claims 21 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent 6,180,239 to Whitesides et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,465,054 to Effenberger.

Regarding Claims 21 and 29, Whitesides et al. teach the method of the invention substantially as claimed, but do not expressly teach solvating with an alkane solvent to control lateral spacing. However, the use of alkane solvent to increase spacing is well known in the art. For example, Effenberger teaches use of an alkane solvent to reduce the % coverage. (C6, L30-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use an alkane solvent in order to increase spacing in the

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2 and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any

intervening claims.

well-known manner.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberts Culbert whose telephone number is (571) 272-1433. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on (571) 272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1763

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

1000

R. Culbert Examiner Art Unit 1763